

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 5-9, 12, 13, and 16-18 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 6, 8, and 9 are independent.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Request for Entry of Response After Final Rejection**

This response should be entered after final rejection because the claim amendments place the application in condition for allowance.

In the event that this response does not place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to enter this response because it places the application into better condition for appeal.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,972,951 (Vartanian). Further, claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vartanian in view of JP 2003-236953 (Nakajima). Further, claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vartanian taken together with U.S. Patent 6,116,427 (Wu). Further, claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vartanian taken together with Wu and further in view of Nakajima.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In the Amendment filed June 25, 2010, the Applicant had presented an argument that the ledge 42 of Vartanian (alleged as being the claimed flange-like engaging section), as well as bottom area of the ledge, cannot function as a section to be engaged by a carrying section, and that ledge 42 would not be accessible for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the bottom area of the ledge is used as supporting for hand to lift and transport the tray. The Examiner alleges that: "There is a large access area between the bottom surface of tray to the bottom area of ledge (42) for the hand to be inserted therein to pick up the tray." (Office Action at page 7).

Applicant submits that there is no basis in fact for the Examiner's assertions. Firstly, Vartanian does not disclose that bottom area of the ledge is used as support for a hand to lift and transport the tray. Also, Vartanian does not disclose that the access area between the bottom surface of the tray to the bottom area of the ledge is large enough for a hand to be inserted therein to pickup the tray.

To the contrary, it can be seen that the "large access area" referred to by the Examiner under the ledge 42 of Vartanian is in fact quite small and much too small for a human hand. This is because the invention of Vartanian is used for carrying video tapes/cassettes which are known in the art to be approx 20 cm (8 inches) in length. Therefore, taking a visual observation of figure 2 of Vartanian (to which the Examiner points) and keeping in mind that the compartment 14 is only 20 cm (8 inches) it is clear that the area under the ledge 42 is approx 1-2 cm (1/2 to 3/4 inches) wide and this is clearly not a "large access area between the bottom surface of tray to bottom area of ledge (42) for the hand to be inserted therein to pick up the tray".

Moreover, the depression 56, which can be clearly seen in Fig. 2 of Vartanian, is described as functioning as a finger recess to facilitate the removal of the video tape which is located within the enlarged compartment 14. It is clear that since this depression 56 is approximately finger sized that an entire hand cannot fit in the area under the ledge 42 of Vartanian.

Secondly, the area beneath the ledge 42 of Vartanian cannot be accessed by an engaging unit moving horizontally into a gap. In particular, when the trays of Vartanian are stacked on top of each other there is no access to a gap under ledge 42. As can be clearly seen from Fig. 1 of Vartanian, the side wall 22 extends around the complete circumference of the tray 10. Furthermore, even if the trays of Vartanian are not stacked, the flange 15 of Vartanian is described as "functions as a resting surface when locating of the tray 10 on a planar supportive surface" (column 2, lines 14-17). Thus, there would still be no access to the area beneath the ledge 42 of Vartanian.

Still, further, Vartanian is completely silent on providing any kind of gap/area that is to be engaged by a carrying section. Vartanian does not mention how the trays are carried. Given that the trays in Vartanian are designed for holding lightweight video tapes/cassettes, and the "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" section of Vartanian describes that the trays are also sold to the customer, Applicant submits that there would be simply no motivation to reconfigure the invention of Vartanian to have a flange like engaging unit of the present invention, as the trays of Vartanian are small and light weight packaging for handling by an end customer.

In order to emphasize these differences over Vartanian's underside of ledge 42, Applicant has amended claim 1 to explicitly recite that the flange-like engaging section is such that a horizontal gap is provided below the flange-like engaging section, to be engaged by a carrying section moving horizontally into the horizontal gap for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray.

A similar amendment is provided for claim 9 as well.

Applicant submits that Vartanian does not at least disclose a horizontal gap provided below the flange-like engaging section and therefore does not disclose this gap sufficient to be engaged by a carrying section moving horizontally into the horizontal gap for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray as defined by amended claim 1.

Applicant submits that none of the secondary references Wu or Nakajima make up for the deficiencies of Vartanian.

For at least the reasons outlined above, we believe that the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 6-8, 13, and 16-18 are allowed.

### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and

complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: November 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs # 48222  
Charles Gorenstein *Robert Downs*  
Registration No.: 29271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000